

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

This Reply is filed in response to the final Official Action of June 9, 2006. Initially, Applicants would like to thank the Examiner for taking the time to conduct a telephone interview with Applicants' undersigned attorney regarding the final Official Action. The final Official Action continues to reject all of the pending claims, namely Claims 1-15, 17-34, 36-48, 50-59, 61 and 62, under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0173295 to Nykanen et al. As explained below, Applicants again respectfully submit that the claimed invention is patentably distinct from Nykanen. In view of the remarks presented below, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of all of the pending claims of the present application. Alternatively, as the remarks presented herein do not raise any new issues or introduce any new matter, Applicants respectfully request entry of this correspondence for purposes of narrowing the issues upon appeal.

Again, Nykanen discloses a system and method for providing context-sensitive web services. As disclosed, the method includes receiving sensor signals characterizing a current environment of the wireless device, and processing those sensor signals with a context inference engine. The context inference engine then outputs a current context result such that useful information is provided to the user in response to the current context result. As further disclosed the context inference engine can be located local to the wireless device or remote from the wireless device at a network server.

According to one claimed aspect of the present invention, as recited by independent Claim 1, a mobile station is recited for managing context-related information. As recited, the mobile station includes a context engine and a communication manager. The context engine is capable of storing context-related information based upon at least a portion of one or more conditions (e.g., sensor reading). In this regard, the context engine is also capable of managing an exchange of the context-related information with one or more context consumers. In turn, then, the communication manager is capable of communicating with one or more context consumers for the exchange of context-related information, with one or more of those context consumer(s) being located external to the mobile station. The mobile station further includes a script engine capable of executing at least a portion of one or more context rules relating to at

least a portion of the context-related information. The context rule(s) are capable of comprising at least a portion of one or more conditions. And as such, the script engine is capable of executing one or more context rules when the respective portion of the condition(s) is satisfied.

As explained in response to the first Official Action, in contrast to the claimed invention, Nykanen does not teach or suggest a mobile station including a script engine executing context rule(s) when condition(s) within those context rule(s) are satisfied. In response to the foregoing, the final Official Action asserts that Nykanen does in fact disclose a script engine in the same manner as the claimed invention. Citing paragraph 0154 of page 10, the final Official Action asserts that Nykanen discloses a Java servlet receiving input, parsing data, performing logic operations and issuing a response to a gateway, and that a Java runtime platform pools the Java servlets to simultaneously service many requests. Applicants respectfully submit, however, that neither paragraph 0154 nor any other paragraph of Nykanen support a script engine or executing context rule(s) as recited by the claimed invention. In this regard, while paragraph 0154 discloses communication between programs that manage device interfaces to a network server, paragraph 0154 does not under any reasonable interpretation teach or suggest rules having conditions or executing rules when those conditions are met, as in the claimed invention.

More particularly, paragraph 0154 discloses a network interface (of the same tier, i.e., presentation tier, including the respective servlets) passes information (in a request message from the gateway) to a visit object of another tier for further processing. During the aforementioned telephone interview, the Examiner indicated that he interpreted the parsing of data and performing of logic operations of the Java servlets to correspond to the recited conditions for executing a rule, and interpreted the further processing of information by the visit object as corresponding to execution of the rule when the aforementioned conditions are satisfied.

Applicants respectfully submit, however, that the aforementioned interpretation of Nykanen proffered by the Examiner cannot reasonably correspond to the respective feature of the claimed invention, and is not consistent with the interpretation of Nykanen alleged to correspond to other features of the claimed invention. In this regard, the claimed invention quite clearly recites context-related information based upon at least a portion of one or more conditions, and a context engine and communication manager for storing, managing and

communicating the context-related information. On page 3, the final Official Action cites page 8, paragraphs 0124-0131 of Nykanen as corresponding to this feature of the claimed invention. In the cited paragraphs, Nykanen discloses a context inference engine that receives and processes sensor data to produce current context result (or awareness) information in such a manner that one could argue that the disclosed sensor data and current context result information correspond to the recited condition(s) and context-related information. This for purposes of comparison shall be referred to as the first interpretation of a condition.

Now, interpreting Nykanen as disclosing the claimed features directed to context rules, the Examiner interprets the recited condition(s) of context rules as corresponding to the disclosed parsing of data and performing of logic operations of the Java servlets. This shall be referred to as the second interpretation of a condition. And as can be readily seen, this second interpretation of a condition is inconsistent with the first interpretation of a condition. In this regard, nowhere does Nykanen teach or suggest context-related information based upon "parsing of data and performing logic operations" (i.e., first interpretation of a condition). The claimed invention clearly recites that conditions not only form the basis for context-related information, but also for context rules. In interpreting Nykanen to read on the claimed invention, however, the Examiner has given two different and inconsistent interpretations of a condition.

One could argue that the first interpretation of a condition more accurately corresponds to the claimed invention. Under such an interpretation, Nykanen does not teach or suggest executing context rule(s) when such condition(s) within those context rule(s) are satisfied, similar to the claimed invention.

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicants respectfully submits that the claimed invention of independent Claim 1, and by dependency Claims 2-15 and 17-19, is patentably distinct from Nykanen. Applicants also respectfully submit that independent Claims 20, 40 and 52 recite subject matter similar to independent Claim 1, including the aforementioned script engine feature of executing context rule(s) when condition(s) within those context rule(s) are satisfied. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that independent Claims 20, 40 and 52, and by dependency Claims 21-34, 36-39, 41-48, 50, 51, 53-59, 61 and 62, are also patentably distinct from Nykanen for at least the same reasons given above with respect to independent

Appl. No.: 10/817,401
Amdt. dated 09/13/2006
Reply to Official Action of June 9, 2006

Claim 1. Applicants therefore respectfully submit that the rejection of Claims 1-15, 17-34, 36-48, 50-59, 61 and 62 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Nykanen is overcome.

Appl. No.: 10/817,401
Amdt. dated 09/13/2006
Reply to Official Action of June 9, 2006

CONCLUSION

In view of the remarks presented above, Applicants respectfully submit that the present application is in condition for allowance. As such, the issuance of a Notice of Allowance is therefore respectfully requested. In order to expedite the examination of the present application, the Examiner is encouraged to contact Applicants' undersigned attorney in order to resolve any remaining issues. As explained above, no new matter or issues are raised by this Reply, and as such, Applicants alternatively respectfully request entry of this Reply for purposes of narrowing the issues upon appeal.

It is not believed that extensions of time or fees for net addition of claims are required, beyond those that may otherwise be provided for in documents accompanying this paper. However, in the event that additional extensions of time are necessary to allow consideration of this paper, such extensions are hereby petitioned under 37 CFR § 1.136(a), and any fee required therefore (including fees for net addition of claims) is hereby authorized to be charged to Deposit Account No. 16-0605.

Respectfully submitted,



Andrew T. Spence
Registration No. 45,699

Customer No. 00826
ALSTON & BIRD LLP
Bank of America Plaza
101 South Tryon Street, Suite 4000
Charlotte, NC 28280-4000
Tel Charlotte Office (704) 444-1000
Fax Charlotte Office (704) 444-1111

ELECTRONICALLY FILED USING THE EFS-WEB ELECTRONIC FILING SYSTEM OF THE UNITED STATES PATENT & TRADEMARK OFFICE ON SEPTEMBER 13, 2006.